



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION
Old State House 150 Benefit Street Providence, RI 02903

Telephone 401-222-2678
TTY 401-222-3700

Fax 401-222-2968
www.preservation.ri.gov

MINUTES
RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION
November 13, 2013

I. MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Michael Abbott, AIA
Mr. Mohamad Farzan, AIA
Mr. Karst Hoogeboom, Chairman
Dr. Patrick Malone
Dr. E. Pierre Morenon
Dr. Ronald Onorato
Mr. Clark Schoettle
Mr. Jonathan Stevens, State Historic Preservation Officer

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Jeffrey Emidy, Sr. Project Review Coordinator
Dr. Richard Greenwood, Deputy Director
Ms. Virginia Hesse, Principal Historical Architect
Dr. Timothy Ives, Principal Archaeologist
Ms. Michaela Jergensen, Sr. RIDOT Reviewer
Ms. Mercedes Monteiro, National Register Assistant - Heritage Aide
Mr. Edward F. Sanderson, Executive Director
Ms. Sarah Zurier, Senior Special Projects Coordinator

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ms. Janet Coit, Director DEM
Ms. Morgan Devlin
Dr. Omur Harmansah
Mr. Michael Hebert, NR Review Board
John P. Leyden, State Building Commissioner
Mr. Jared L. Rhodes, Chief of Statewide Planning representing Kevin Flynn, Asso. Dir
Mr. Pieter N. Roos
Mr. Marcel Valois, Executive Director EDC

GUESTS

No guests were present.

II. AGENDA

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:32 A.M., Karst Hoogeboom, Chairman, presiding.

2. Minutes of October 9, 2013

On a motion by Dr. Morenon, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously

VOTED to approve the Minutes of October 9, 2013.

3. Chairman's Welcome

Chairman Hoogeboom welcomed Jonathan Stevens as a new member of the Commission, having recently been appointed State Historic Preservation Officer. Mr. Hoogeboom noted that the Executive Director's report will summarize RIHPHC's statutory responsibilities.

Mr. Hoogeboom stated that Rhode Island has the nation's most dense concentration of historic resources which are a critical state resource. The Commission is the State leader in historic preservation and for many years has carried out a variety of successful programs in collaboration with other public and private partners. These collaborations include working with Fort Adams Trust to create a master plan for preservation and interpretation; annual Heritage Festivals; a low-interest loan program for preservation projects; establishment and interpretation of preservation guidelines that are used throughout the state; an annual statewide historic preservation conference that is one of the largest and most successful in the United States; the recent purchase of the Salt Pond Archaeological Site in cooperation with the RI Department of Transportation; drafting Capital Center development guidelines, and soon to work with the I-195 Redevelopment Commission on development guidelines. The Commission's work to identify, preserve, and protect historic resources has earned an excellent reputation statewide and nationally.

Mr. Hoogeboom asked Mr. Stevens to share his perspective on the Commission's work and to offer his ideas for new initiatives.

Mr. Stevens replied that Governor Chafee's appointments of current Commissioners reflect his confidence in the members. The Governor is proud of the Commission and offers a "hardy endorsement of RIHPHC's work." Governor Chafee and Mr. Stevens want the Commission to "stay the course" and continue to do the good work that has characterized RIHPHC. He complimented the Commission on the excellent quality staff and their success in establishing a preservation ethic in Rhode Island.

As SHPO, Mr. Stevens would like to help RIHPHC with its state infrastructure, particularly physical improvements and restoration work at the Old State House which needs a new roof, re-

engineered heating and cooling systems, masonry restoration, website and information technology improvements. Mr. Hoozeboom added that the Tulip trees on the Parade need protection from the state grounds workers. Mr. Stevens also will work with RIHPHC and RIDOT to open the delayed archaeological repository planned for the historic Woonsocket Railroad Depot.

Mr. Stevens listed several programmatic initiatives he plans to pursue. The state guide plan element for historic preservation meets technical requirements, but could benefit from further discussion of implementation strategies. New coastal requirements to elevate structures above flood hazards pose a challenge for historic buildings. The State Economic Development Corporation programs should give greater recognition for the cultural and creative sectors of the economy. The City of Newport's efforts to secure World Heritage Designation could be supported by appointment of a state Newport World Heritage Commission. Mr. Stevens hopes to be active at the national level, assuring continued Congressional support for federal historic preservation programs and creation of the Blackstone Valley National Historical Park.

Mr. Stevens concluded by congratulating the Commission on its excellent track record of supporting and enabling historic preservation throughout Rhode Island. He noted that RIHPHC "is a great brand," and that "Ted Sanderson is the face of historic preservation for the state;" he said he does not want to change those things.

Mr. Hoozeboom thanked Mr. Stevens for his comments, and he noted that the expertise of RIHPHC Commissioners has been of great value over many years and currently; Commissioners are experts on Rhode Island's historic properties, and they provide leadership on preservation issues.

Mr. Schoettle observed that the Commission's work and the work of the State Historic Preservation Officer during the tenure of Fred Williamson and Ted Sanderson has generally been able to keep clear of political decision-making which has been good for historic preservation's reputation as a non-political shared value in Rhode Island. Mr. Schoettle wondered how Mr. Stevens would balance his own roles as SHPO and Senior Advisor to Governor Chafee?

Mr. Stevens answered that it is a "grey area;" public dialogue and decision makers always have the potential for political considerations, but Governor Chafee is not inclined to make historic preservation into a political issue. Mr. Stevens also noted that his appointment as SHPO will only last for about one year to the end of Governor Chafee's term.

Mr. Schoettle stated that the developers he has worked with on historic preservation tax credit projects assume that projects are professionally reviewed in accordance with the preservation standards; in his opinion it is very important that there are no exceptions to the established review process for political reasons. Mr. Stevens agreed.

Mr. Hoozeboom mentioned that RIHPHC and RIDOT have developed a strong working

relationship, particularly between Director Mike Lewis and Executive Director Ted Sanderson. RIDOT is a major client for RIHPHC services, as are other state and municipal agencies that receive federal funding and require RIHPHC staff review in order to comply with federal historic preservation laws and regulations.

Mr. Stevens agreed, and he noted that he has worked with RIDOT to paint public art murals along Interstate 95.

Mr. Abbott expressed interest in having RIHPHC work on the issue of how new coastal regulations will affect historic buildings, especially with respect to flood insurance requirements that buildings be elevated above flood hazard heights. Dr. Greenwood reported that RIHPHC staff already are working with the Coastal Resources Management Council and URI Coastal Institute on these issues, and that currently there is not a settled understanding of federal and state requirements. Coastal mapping is still in progress, and it is likely that the impact of new coastal rules will be unevenly experienced statewide. Some coastal areas have few endangered historic buildings due to topography and the previous destruction of the hurricanes of 1838 and 1954. In other areas, such as the Browning's Beach in South Kingstown, the historic buildings could not be protected. Wickford, Warren, and the Point Neighborhood in Newport are among the most at-risk historic areas. Several Commissioners agreed coastal regulations will be an important historic preservation issue, and they requested that the topic be scheduled for discussion on a future Commission agenda.

4. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Sanderson presented a written report from Mr. Stevens and himself that described coordination between the SHPO and RIHPHC. Mr. Stevens has re-appointed Mr. Sanderson and Dr. Greenwood as Deputy SHPOs with authority to sign any and all documents required for the federal historic preservation program. The report describes the statutory responsibilities of the RIHPHC in state legislation and the responsibilities of the SHPO in federal legislation, which are very similar. The report further explains that in RIHPHC review process, professional staff members represent both the state and the federal historic preservation mandates. In the RIHPHC process, state and federal responsibilities are intertwined and concurrent. The report details how review of specific federal program actions proceeds through sequential incremental steps that lead to final decisions in accordance with federal regulations. The report is appended to these Minutes.

5. Hurricane Sandy Disaster Relief Grants

Mr. Sanderson introduced the Hurricane Sandy Disaster Relief Grants program. In March of 2013, the National Park Service reported that Congressional appropriations for Hurricane Sandy disaster relief included \$3.2 million for repair and restoration of historic properties that were damaged by Hurricane Sandy in Rhode Island. RIHPHC staff submitted a formal application for the funding in June and received NPS grant approval in August. RIHPHC staff issued a

program announcement and solicited preliminary applications during the summer of 2013. Final applications were sent to eligible applicants with an October 31 deadline. Sarah Zurier has organized and managed the application process and RIHPHC staff review. All projects have been visited by RIHPHC professional staff, and all application have been evaluated using a standard grant score sheet. Copies of the score sheet and a list of applications with staff scores was distributed to Commissioners.

Ms. Zurier introduced each project; presented a photographic survey of the historic property and the damage suffered; and summarized the applicant's requested scope of work and funding request.

One project has been determined not to meet federal eligibility: Barney House, Spring Street, Newport is owned by Congregation Jeshuat Israel, and federal rules do not permit grants to properties owned by religious organizations.

Historic Landscapes: Several historic landscapes suffered damage from Hurricane Sandy.

Project 13-20: The Breakers and Chateau-sur-Mer (both individual NHL) and Rosecliff (Bellevue Avenue Historic District (NHL)), Newport. Specimen trees that were part of historic designed landmarks at The Breakers, Rosecliff, and Chateau-sur-Mer, properties of the Preservation Society of Newport County, were destroyed. These properties are among the most visited historic sites in Rhode Island. The grant requests \$23,389 to replace the trees.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Hoogeboom, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission VOTED unanimously to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-17: Hazard's Castle, Ocean Road Historic District (NR), Narragansett. Developed as a private estate in the 19th century, the property is now owned by Middlebridge School, and there is public access to the property). Historic tree plantings that were part of the estate's designed landscape were destroyed by Hurricane Sandy. The grant request includes \$116,744 in eligible costs to remove and replace damaged trees.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Hoogeboom, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission VOTED unanimously to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-4: Dunmere, Narragansett (NR individual). Various historic landscape features were damaged at this privately owned waterfront estate developed by financier Robert Graham Dun in the 1880s. RIHPHC staff reported that further evaluation of the proposed work and budget was needed. Evaluation also identified a high project cost in relation to the benefit to historic resources. The property is not open to the public.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Hoogeboom, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to defer consideration of the project subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-9: Stillhouse Cove, Cranston. Stillhouse Cove is a waterfront public park and scenic feature that contributes to the Edgewood Historic Districts. It was developed in 1914 as part of the Metropolitan Park Commission's efforts to preserve open space and create public parks in Providence and neighboring communities. The park was inundated during Hurricane Sandy, and a mature tree was damaged. Shoreline and salt-marsh restoration work has been accomplished, but the grassy area of the park remains unrestored. RIHPHC staff evaluation identified a relatively low cost would result in significant benefit to the public in restoring this historic park area.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Abbott, seconded by Dr. Onorato, the Commission VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service. All Commissioners voted in the affirmative, except Mr. Stevens who did not participate in the review and recused from voting because of his personal involvement in the Stillhouse Cove project.

Project 13-13: Newport Cliff Walk, Ochre Point/Cliffs Historic District, Bellevue Avenue NHL. Several areas along the Newport Cliff Walk were affected by Hurricane Sandy, including a stone retaining wall north of Webster Street constructed in 1911 that requires repair and repointing; a vegetated bluff south of Forty Steps that suffered erosion; and a small area near The Breakers where riprap washed out.

During discussion, several Commissioners noted the high level of significance of the Newport Cliff Walk as a historic landscape feature and as a heavily visited public space. There was general agreement that the 1911 masonry retaining wall is a historic feature of the Cliff Walk, and it should be repaired. Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Onorato, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve repair of the stone retaining wall in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Discussion continued regarding the two areas of erosion along the Cliff Walk. Mr. Hoogeboom observed that both areas are well above the shoreline and therefore should be considered as part of the historic landscape of the Cliff Walk. Furthermore, several Commissioners expressed concern about the structural preservation of the Cliff Walk if the eroded areas were not repaired. Dr. Onorato expressed his strong support for preservation of the Cliff Walk, but he was not convinced that the eroded areas are historic features and he was concerned that these areas are likely to wash out again in the next major storm. Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Hoogeboom, seconded by Mr. Farzan, the Commission VOTED to approve the two projects to repair the eroded areas in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service. All Commissioners voted in the affirmative, except Dr. Onorato who voted no.

Project 13-12: Watch Hill Lighthouse, Watch Hill Historic District (NR), Westerly. Watch Hill Lighthouse is owned by the U.S. Coast Guard but the property is maintained under a lease to Watch Hill Lighthouse Keepers Association which also operates a small museum in the former fog signal building; the Lighthouse site is open to the public.

Two areas of Hurricane Sandy damage have been identified. First, at the historic fog signal (museum) building, foundation soils were washed out, the building foundation was undermined and its structural integrity has been jeopardized. Repair of the building foundation is needed with replacement of the foundation soil and reconstruction of the stone revetment along the peninsula. Second, 220' of a beach cobble wall that lined the entrance road to the Lighthouse was destroyed and should be rebuilt.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Schoettle, seconded by Mr. Farzan, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-8: Block Island Southeast Lighthouse (individual NHL). Southeast Lighthouse began operation in 1875 and was dramatically relocated from the eroding Mohegan Bluffs in 1993. During Hurricane Sandy, slate roof shingles were blown off the building's roof; the project cost is very modest.

Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Onorato, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-21: Newport Congregational Church Parish House, Newport NHL district. The property was acquired from the Newport Congregational Church by the non-profit LaFarge Restoration Foundation organization and is used for a variety of community services and private commercial rentals. Hurricane Sandy resulted in a hole in the Parish Hall's metal roof, and some interior water damage resulted; the project cost is very modest.

Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Onorato, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-14: Peace Dale Manufacturing Company Barn and Shed, Peace Dale Historic District (NR), South Kingstown. The two properties, secondary historic structures built in the 1860s, suffered roof damage due to Hurricane Sandy; the project cost is modest.

Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Malone, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-35: Ochre Court and Vinland (Ochre Point/Cliffs HD, Bellevue Avenue NHL), Newport. Ochre Court, built in 1892 to designs by Richard Morris Hunt and now used as the Administration building for Salve Regina University, suffered roof damage due to Hurricane Sandy; the project cost is modest. Designed by Peabody & Stearns, Vinland (1882) also suffered roof damage; the project cost is modest.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Farzan, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-3: Benjamin Church House (individual NR), Bristol. Built in 1903-09 as the Benjamin Church Home for Aged Men, this historic building now serves as the (Town of) Bristol Senior Center. It suffered damage to the roof, storm windows, windows, shutters, and back porch due to Hurricane Sandy; the project cost is modest.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Farzan, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-18: The Towers (individual NR), Narragansett. The iconic Towers, the surviving portion of McKim, Mead & White's 1883-86 Narragansett Casino, suffered roof damage due to Hurricane Sandy. The asphalt roof was destroyed, and a new wood shingle roof restores the building's historic appearance.

Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Onorato, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-11: The W.T. Grant Department Store, Downtown Pawtucket Historic District (NR). The historic commercial building suffered roof damage due to Hurricane Sandy when skylights were destroyed and the rubber roof membrane failed, damaging the roof and allowing significant interior water damage.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Abbott, seconded by Mr. Schoettle, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-10: Stone Lea, Ocean Road Historic District (NR), Narragansett. This waterfront private house and grounds received damage to an enclosed porch and terrace, roof, storm windows, and stone walls. RIHPHC staff reported that further evaluation of the proposed work and budget was needed. Evaluation also identified a high project cost in relation to the benefit to historic resources. The property is not open to the public.

Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Onorato, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission unanimously VOTED to defer consideration of the project subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-2: First Beavertail Lighthouse Foundation (Beavertail Light NR), Jamestown. Beavertail Point has been in continuous use as the site of a navigational beacon since 1712. In 1749 a wooden tower was built under the supervision of Newport architect Peter Harrison; the first Beavertail Lighthouse Foundation supported the first and second lighthouses until 1856 when the current granite lighthouse was constructed. Beavertail Lighthouse is owned by the U.S. Coast Guard and leased to the State of Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management which maintains Beavertail Park. A Memorandum of Understanding between RI-DEM and the non-profit Beavertail Lighthouse Museum Association organization allows BLMA to operate the historic lighthouse complex as a museum. Recently, the Association has undertaken to stabilize and restore the 1749 tower foundation. Their efforts were seriously damaged by Hurricane Sandy, and the historic first lighthouse foundation requires repairs. Additional work may be required to stabilize the foundation of the historic fog signal building (ca. 1820s).

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Abbott, seconded by Mr. Schoettle, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-24: Bristol Ferry Lighthouse (part of Lighthouses of R.I. NR), Bristol. This historic lighthouse erected in 1855 and retired from service in 1927 is now used as a private residence. It suffered significant exterior and interior damage from Hurricane Sandy, necessitating a new roof, chimney repairs, plaster replacement, floor structure and floor replacement, and sitework. Also, the roof of the historic oilhouse (1904) was repaired.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Abbott, seconded by Dr. Malone, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-7: Rose Island Lighthouse (individual NR and Fort Hamilton Historic District NR), Newport. This historic lighthouse complex is now owned by the City of Newport, operated by the Rose Island Lighthouse Foundation, and open to the public. Hurricane Sandy caused damage to the stone bastion of historic Fort Hamilton (1798)—on which the lighthouse was built in 1869—and to the concrete foundation of the foghorn building (1885).

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Schoettle, seconded by Mr. Farzan, the Commission unanimously VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-5: Clambake Club (individual NR), Middletown. This historic private club was built

ca. 1905 perched on a waterfront bluff and rebuilt in 1939 following the destructive hurricane of 1938. Historic photographs show that the waterfront portion of the club building was supported on exposed piles, reportedly resting on bedrock. Over the years, fill material has been placed under the building and subsequently has washed away. During Hurricane Sandy, significant shoreline erosion occurred along 15 feet of the Clambake Club property, including removal of fill soil under the building. The building itself appears not to have incurred significant damage and the structural piers remain in place. The Club is embarking on a \$2.5 million shoreline reconstruction project. RIHPHC staff reported that further evaluation of the proposed work and budget was needed, including obtaining information about a possible repair to the foundation of the historic building. Evaluation also identified a high project cost in relation to the benefit to historic resources. The property is not open to the public.

Following discussion, on a motion by Mr. Abbott, seconded by Mr. Schoettle, the Commission unanimously VOTED to defer consideration of the project subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service.

Project 13-38: Temple Beth-El (individual NR), Providence. Built in 1910-11 to designs by Banning & Thornton, the historic synagogue is architecturally significant, and it represents the expansion of Providence's Jewish community through the first decades of the 20th century. The building, currently owned by Congregation Beth Sholom, has been vacant for a number of years and in deteriorating condition. Temporary roof repairs made in 2011 were destroyed by Hurricane Sandy, resulting in further roof and interior damage and leaving the property unprotected to the weather. Community organizations have proposed to acquire Temple Beth-El, restore it, and operate a community-based market and other programs. In its current ownership, the building is not eligible to receive a federal grant, but new ownership may be pending. Replacement of the damaged roof is an essential repair for the building, but its deteriorated condition will require extensive additional repairs and rehabilitation before it can be placed in service, and funding for such work is not currently available. Construction professionals who have visited the building believe it is structurally sound, but an engineer's evaluation has not been obtained.

Following discussion, on a motion by Dr. Onorato, seconded by Mr. Abbott, the Commission VOTED to approve the project in concept subject to further review by RIHPHC staff and the National Park Service. Mr. Schoettle did not vote on the project because he has provided assistance to community groups that are potential grantees for the project.

6. Other business

There was no other business.

7. Next regular meeting date: Wednesday December 11, 2013 at 9:30 AM.

8. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 11:59 A.M.

Minutes recorded by,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Edward F. Sanderson".

Edward F. Sanderson, Executive Director



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION

Old State House 150 Benefit Street Providence, RI 02903

Telephone 401-222-2678

Fax 401-222-2968

www.preservation.ri.gov

TTY 401-222-3700

MEMORANDUM

To: RIHPHC Commissioners

From: Edward F. Sanderson, Executive Director, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Jonathan Stevens, State Historic Preservation Officer

Re: Responsibilities of the RIHPHC and the SHPO

Date: November 13, 2013

This memorandum is a report to the RIHPHC Commissioners regarding coordination of responsibilities of the RIHPHC and the State Historic Preservation Officer. At its October 9, 2013 meeting, it was announced that Governor Chafee had appointed Jonathan Stevens to serve as State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in place of Edward F. Sanderson, and the Commission requested this report.

The RIHPHC is the state agency for all state historic preservation and heritage programs. RIHPHC Commissioners provide broad program oversight and approve loans, grants, and National Register nominations (sitting as the National Register Review Board), while RIHPHC staff perform the day-to-day work of implementing historic preservation programs.

The SHPO is the Governor's representative for federal historic preservation programs carried out in each state on behalf of the National Park Service and the U. S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The SHPO is an *ex officio* member of the RIHPHC Commission, and relies on RIHPHC staff to perform the day-to-day work of implementing federal historic preservation programs.

Throughout its history, RIHPHC has managed the federal historic preservation program concurrently with the state program as an orderly and predictable process carried out by professional staff working in accordance with state and federal regulations and standards. Most

of the work involves elements of both state and federal regulations, funding, and administration. The Commission staff organizational chart does not separate state and federal programs; state and federal responsibilities are parallel and interconnected. This integration of state and federal programs assumes that the RIHPHC executive director is authorized to carry out both state and federal responsibilities. Over the last four weeks, Jonathan, Ted, and Rick Greenwood (RIHPHC Deputy Director) met several times to discuss coordination between the RIHPHC and the SHPO; during this time, federal program reviews were suspended.

On October 24, 2013, Jonathan re-appointed Ted and Rick to serve as Deputy SHPOs and authorized them to carry out the day-to-day functions of the SHPO. Jonathan will sign final National Register nominations following approval by the RIHPHC National Register Review Board, and Jonathan, Ted, and Rick will consult together regarding review of projects that raise significant policy issues or that have attracted a high level of public interest.

RIHPHC Responsibilities carried out by the Executive Director and RIHPHC staff

The responsibilities of the RI Historical Preservation & Heritage Commission are set forth in RI General Law 42-45-5.

- 1) Survey, evaluate, and register historic properties.
- 2) Appoint a state review board and nominate properties to the state and national registers of historic places.
- 3) Review and comment on state, city and town projects that affect historic properties.
- 4) Participate in state planning.
- 5) Advise state agencies regarding historic preservation and review the treatment of state-owned historic properties.
- 6) Administer, review and approve state historic preservation tax credits (44-33.6).
- 7) Grant or loan funds for historic preservation.
- 8) Apply for and receive federal historic preservation grants on behalf of the state.

Federal Responsibilities certified by the SHPO

The responsibilities of the State Historic Preservation Officer are set forth in Section 101(b)(3) of the National Historic Preservation Act.

- 1) Survey and inventory historic properties.

- 2) Nominate eligible properties to the National Register.
- 3) Consult with Federal agencies about undertakings that may affect historic properties to protect or to reduce or mitigate harm to such properties.
- 4) Cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, and individuals to ensure that historic properties are taken into consideration at all levels of planning and development; and prepare and implement a Statewide Historic Preservation Plan.
- 5) Advise and assist Federal and State agencies and local governments in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities; and cooperate with local governments in the development of local historic preservation programs.
- 6) Provide advice and assistance in the evaluation of proposals for rehabilitation projects that may qualify for Federal preservation tax incentives.
- 7) Administer the program of Federal grant assistance for historic preservation within the State.
- 8) Provide public information, education, training, and technical assistance relating to historic preservation.

SHPO Operational Decisions

A primary goal of RIHPHC administration has been to make historic preservation programs and processes professionally administered in accordance with regulations, fact-based, objective and transparent to the interested public, predictable, and focused on successful out-comes. RIHPHC has achieved success in meeting this goal by having professional staff historians, architectural historians, archaeologists, and architects participate in project development and consult regularly with applicants and clients. RIHPHC staff, supervised by the Executive Director, represent state and federal mandates and the authority of the SHPO. Applicants and clients for historic preservation programs are advised that assurances, decisions, or approvals provided incrementally during the course of a project will not be overturned or reversed at the time of final review and approval. The great majority of the work of RIHPHC is carried out in agreement with consulting parties.

1. Survey, inventory, National Register of Historic Places.

Last year, RIHPHC staff administered National Register nominations for 246 historic properties.

Survey and inventory are staff functions often supplemented by consultants. No direct SHPO action is required.

National Register nominations generally flow from survey and inventory work. The RIHPHC professional staff and the Commission's National Register Review Board are responsible for administering the nomination process and for evaluation of properties' significance in accordance with NPS regulations and guidance. Most National Register individual property nominations have the support of the property owner, and most National Register historic district nominations have the support of the residents and local government. Controversy or disagreement is unusual; eligibility is determined by professional staff and the Review Board; and the authorized SHPO or Deputy SHPO signature on the nomination form certifies that the process has followed NPS regulations.

Rarely, there are owners who object to nomination of their property or there may be local planning reasons for a city or town to request that a property not be nominated.

2. Project review.

Last year, RIHPHC staff issued 779 written comments on federal projects.

Federal undertakings are reviewed under authority of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in accordance with the Procedures of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (36CFR Part 800). While consultation is at the heart of project review, the process follows a well-defined and formal set of sequential steps carried out by RIHPHC professional staff and the applicant, and generally, the consulting parties concur in the findings. Each review activity under this authority must have an authorized SHPO or Deputy SHPO signature.

"No properties" is a finding that the project area of potential effect contains no historic properties.

"No effect" is a finding that the project will not have an effect on historic properties.

"Potentially eligible for the National Register" is a finding based on RIHPHC files that a property may meet National Register eligibility criteria.

"Considered eligible" is a finding that RIHPHC and the applicant have agreed to treat a property as though it meets National Register eligibility criteria.

"Determination of Eligibility" is a finding by the National Park Service that it has reviewed adequate documentation and found that the property meets National Register eligibility criteria.

"No adverse effect" is a finding that a historic property within the project area of potential effect will not be harmed by the project.

"No adverse effect with conditions" is a finding that a historic property within the project area of

potential effect will not be harmed by the project provided that certain conditions are met regarding treatment of the property or design of the project. These conditions are set by the RIHPHC.

“Adverse effect” is a finding that a historic property within the project area of potential effect will be harmed by the project.

“Memorandum of Agreement with standard conditions” is a document signed by the consulting parties that sets forth standard provisions that will avoid, minimize, or reduce harm to the affected historic property, such as assuring that rehabilitation will follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards or documentation and recordation of a historic property that cannot be preserved.

“Programmatic Agreement” is a document signed by the consulting parties for a project that will be implemented over a period of time such as a year or more and that may involve properties and effects that cannot be known in advance. For example, a city’s Community Development Block Grant project to rehabilitate deteriorated houses throughout the city. A “PA” sets forth standard provisions that the applicant agrees to follow in implementing the project, such as consulting with the RIHPHC regarding the historical significance of properties once they have been identified and agreeing to adhere to standard treatments that will avoid, minimize, or reduce harm to the affected historic property such as assuring that rehabilitation will follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

Rarely, a project may raise issues that cannot be resolved through the normal consultation and agreement upon standard conditions, and in such a case the provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement must be carefully negotiated. When the issues involve particularly significant historic properties or when the adverse effects of the project will have a very serious impact, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and/or the National Park Service may directly participate in the project consultation. In a very few cases, the consulting parties may reach a “Failure to Agree,” and the ACHP will formally comment on the project to the head of the federal agency.

3. Review of Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Projects

Last year, RIHPHC staff reviewed federal historic preservation tax credit applications representing investment of \$88 million.

Like the Rhode Island state historic preservation tax credit, the federal tax credit review process relies on a Certification of Historical Significance (Part 1), Certification of Proposed Historic Rehabilitation (Part 2), and Certification of Completed Rehabilitation (Part 3). State historic preservation office staff review and comment on applications and forward them to NPS for final approval. RIHPHC staff architects, historians, and architectural historians, under the direction of the Executive Director, work closely with applicants to provide technical assistance and assure

that projects meet NPS and RIHPHC standards and will be approved. The signature of the SHPO or Deputy SHPO on the Part 1, 2, and 3 applications certifies that qualified professional staff have reviewed and commented on the project in accordance with federal regulations and guidelines. Often standard conditions are included in the certification, such as standard masonry cleaning and mortar mix and repointing, repair or replacement of historic window sash, treatment of interior painted surfaces, or avoiding installation of visible ductwork adjacent to windows.

Rarely, an applicant does not agree with RIHPHC staff review comments and recommendations for conditions. In all cases, NPS has the final review and approval for federal tax credit applications.

4. Historic Preservation Fund Administration

Last year, RIHPHC programs received \$558,490 in federal funding and \$1,156,791 in state funding. In addition, RIHPHC staff managed \$111,698 in federal Certified Local Government grants, \$87,303 in federal American Battlefield Protection Grants for the Nipsachuck project, and presently are administering \$3,200,000 in federal Hurricane Sandy Disaster Relief Grants.

RIHPHC operations are funded jointly by state appropriations and NPS funding (HPF). NPS-49 is the HPF grants manual and provides extensive detail regarding state historic preservation office use and reporting of HPF funds. Each year, RIHPHC submits an annual HPF work plan that describes how the state's apportionment will be spent; and at the end of the year RIHPHC submits an end-of-year report that documents actual expenditures and performance. The annual HPF work plan and the end-of-year report require numerous certifications and assurances by an authorized SHPO or Deputy SHPO that federal regulations and procedures are being met.

Throughout the year, RIHPHC staff implement the work program and expend HPF funds based on the certifications and assurances.

5. Policy Development with the National Park Service, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Alliance of Preservation Commissions, individual federal agencies, and other historic preservation partner organizations.

State Historic Preservation Officers are important participants in the national historic preservation program and consult regarding implementation of NHPA programs with the Department of the Interior and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. SHPOs may also participate in discussions of federal legislation and appropriations, and they consult regarding implementation of historic preservation regulations by federal agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration, FEMA, Army Corps of Engineers, HUD, etc. In addition, SHPOs may attend meetings and conferences to represent the issues and concerns of their state's Governor and the state preservation program.

Future Goals of the State Historic Preservation Officer

Jonathan and Governor Chafee have voiced their support for historic preservation and for the work performed by RIHPHC. As Senior Advisor and Director for Special Projects for Governor Chafee, Jonathan plans to offer a higher profile for historic preservation within state government. He has a commitment to working with the Economic Development Corporation to foster the cultural and creative sectors of our state economy. He also has an interest in reviewing the 2012 strategic plan with Commission members and staff, with a focus on more specificity in the implementation element and an affirmation of the value RIHPHC and its partners have in strengthening the economy and enhancing valuable cultural resources. In addition, he supports plans to strengthen information technology at RIHPHC, and he will work for funding in 2014 for state historic preservation tax credits and for State Preservation Grants for historic sites. Jonathan looks forward to working with the Commission as other important preservation issues emerge.



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION

Old State House 150 Benefit Street Providence, RI 02903

Telephone 401-222-2678
TTY 401-222-3700Fax 401-222-2968
www.preservation.ri.gov**2013 Hurricane Sandy Evaluation Score Sheet**

Project Name _____

Project Address _____

PROJECT SCORE _____**Grant Criteria:**

The RIHPHC will consider the following criteria when selecting recipients for Hurricane Sandy Disaster Relief grants for Historic Properties:

- Historic significance of the property
- Severity and nature of the damage to the historic property
- Ability of the project to repair the storm related damage
- Project cost and benefit to the public
- Ability of the applicant to manage and complete the project promptly and successfully
- Completeness and accuracy of the grant application.

Even though emergency assistance is involved, RIHPHC must still consider the applicant's ability to successfully complete the proposed project, and whether the funds awarded will achieve a significant preservation objective.

1. Historic significance of the property

- 1 -3 points: Property contributes to the overall significance of a historic district but lacks individual significance
- 4 – 6 points: Property is within a historic district or is individually registered and is a very good example of its type and/or is a local landmark
- 7 – 10 points: Property possesses individual distinction and is considered significant when compared with other historic properties statewide

2. Severity and nature of the damage to the historic property
 - 1 – 3 points: Damage did not affect significant historic features but may have an overall impact to preservation of the property
 - 4 – 6 points: Damage affects significant historic features and has an impact on preservation of the property
 - 7 – 10 points: Damage affects highly visible significant historic features and/or threatens the historic property.
3. Ability of the project to repair the storm related damage
 - 1 – 3 points: Project will not effectively repair storm related damage
 - 4 – 6 points: Project will repair significant storm damage
 - 7 – 10 points: Project will fully repair storm damage and restore the historic property
4. Project cost and benefit to the public
 - 1 – 3 points: High project cost in relation to the preservation and public benefit
 - 4 – 6 points: Project cost is balanced by the preservation and public benefit
 - 7 – 10 points: Important preservation and public benefits justify the project cost
5. Ability of the applicant to manage and complete the project promptly and successfully
 - 1 – 3 points: Applicant shows little ability to manage the project and/or other factors make this a challenging project to manage.
 - 4 – 6 points: Applicant's administrative capacity is commensurate with the scope of the project.
 - 7 – 10 points: Applicant has demonstrated capacity to manage the project
6. Completeness and accuracy of the grant application.

Not eligible: Applicant has not submitted a complete and accurate application.
Eligible: Applicant has submitted a complete and accurate application.

COMMENTS: